

Agenda

August 3, 2004, 10:00-4:00

AmerenCIPS Building, 607 East Adams, Springfield

Note: We will be starting and ending 15 minutes earlier, to accommodate travel. We will also be breaking to allow participants to attend the ICC's Electric Policy Committee meeting at 1:00 p.m., with our afternoon discussion to resume after that meeting.

I. Procedural Matters

- Open process / encouragement of free dialog
- Consensus principles – applicability of traditional settlement discussion role to non-consensus items and “brainstorming” of issues and alternatives
- Anti-trust compliance

II. Discussion of Draft Progress Reports (separately distributed documents)

- July 27 RWG Meeting Proposed Report

III. Continued Discussion of Demand Response, Efficiency, Renewable Issues

B. Cost recovery

52) *How should costs related to energy efficiency and demand reduction be charged in rates?*

53) *How should costs for obtaining renewable energy be charged in rates?*

64B) *... How can electricity providers be provided with cost recovery assurances and incentives that will lead to the necessary infrastructure being put in place?*

C. Other issues

56) *Should utilities be required to demonstrate consideration of energy efficiency, demand reduction, and distributed generation strategies as part of any proposal for new distribution and/or transmission facilities?*

61) *Should Integrated Distribution Company (IDC) rules be changed to provide the option to promote green power, real-time pricing tariffs, curtailable rate options, etc..., by the distribution company?*

IV. Begin Discussion of Other Rate Design Issues

A. Production / commodity cost recovery and rate design

41) *Rate design issues can also have significant competitive implications. Unless rates are designed to send correct price signals, economically efficient consumption decisions and economically efficient competition will not necessarily result. How can decisions about the method of recovery of production costs and*

the allocation of those costs among rates and customers be made in a manner likely to promote efficiency, and efficient competition between providers and resources?

B. Switching rules and hedging costs

37) To what extent can rate design and switching rules reduce the costs of hedging? What are the implications for such changes on the competitive retail marketplace?

C. Delivery cost recovery and rate design

48) Should charges be restructured to more accurately reflect the costs of providing delivery and customer services that do not vary significantly based on the kilowatt-hours consumed (e.g., standby service rates)?

D. Other rate design issues

46) Can or should rates be restructured to eliminate inter and intra-class subsidies in existing bundled rates?

49) Should some or all rates for some or all of the rate classes be determined on a seasonal basis?

E. “Special” rates

47) Should “special rates” (e.g., space heating, lighting) be maintained?

93) Is there a role for economic development “rates” in a post-transition marketplace? If so, should tariffed non-competitive energy services offered by utilities be the vehicle, or can the State implement economic development programs through the competitive sector as well?[†]

F. Alternative regulation

65) Should the requirements related to approval of alternative regulation plans be revisited with a goal of setting forth more realistic requirements so such plans could actually be implemented?

[†] This Issue was transferred to the RWG from the EAWG.